

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN
MILWAUKEE DIVISION

DANIEL WATKINS,
on behalf of himself and
all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

BARDES PLASTICS, INC.
5225 West Clinton Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53223

Defendant

Case No. 20-cv-316

**COLLECTIVE AND CLASS
ACTION COMPLAINT
PURSUANT TO 29 U.S.C. §216(b)
AND FED. R. CIV. P. 23**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

COMPLAINT

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. This is a collective and class action brought pursuant to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, (“FLSA”), and Wisconsin’s Wage Payment and Collection Laws, Wis. Stat. § 109.01 *et seq.*, Wis. Stat. § 104.01 *et seq.*, Wis. Stat. § 103.001 *et seq.*, Wis. Admin. Code § DWD 274.01 *et seq.*, and Wis. Admin. Code § DWD 272.001 *et seq.* (“WWPCL”) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 23, by Plaintiff, Daniel Watkins, on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated current and former hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees of Defendant, Bardes Plastics, Inc., for purposes of obtaining relief under the FLSA and WWPCL for unpaid overtime compensation, unpaid agreed upon wages, liquidated damages, costs, attorneys’ fees, declaratory and/or injunctive relief, and/or any such other relief the Court may deem appropriate.

2. Defendant, Bardes Plastics, Inc., is a plastics packaging company headquartered in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

3. Defendant operated (and continues to operate) an unlawful compensation system that deprived and failed to compensate Plaintiff and all other current and former hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees for all hours worked and work performed each workweek, including at an overtime rate of pay. Specifically, Defendant shaved time from Plaintiff's and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees' weekly timesheets for pre-shift, post-shift, and in-shift hours worked and/or work performed.

4. Defendant's failure to compensate its hourly paid, non-exempt Production employees for compensable work performed each workweek, including but not limited to at an overtime rate of pay, was intentional, willful, and violated federal law as set forth in the FLSA and state law as set forth in the WWPCL.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. This Court has original federal question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because this case is brought under the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. §§ 201, *et seq.*

6. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367, over the state law claims, Wisconsin's Wage Payment and Collection Laws, Wis. Stat. § 109.01 *et seq.*, Wis. Stat. § 104.01 *et seq.*, Wis. Stat. § 103.001 *et seq.*, Wis. Admin. Code § DWD 274.01 *et seq.*, and Wis. Admin. Code § DWD 272.001 *et seq.*, because they are so related in this action within such original jurisdiction that they form part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution.

7. Venue in this district is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c), because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in this District, and Defendant has substantial and systematic contacts in this District.

PARTIES

8. Defendant is a Milwaukee, Wisconsin-based company with a principal office address of 5225 West Clinton Avenue, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53223.

9. For purposes of the FLSA, Defendant was an “employer” of an “employee,” Plaintiff, as those terms are used in 29 U.S.C. §§ 203(d) and (e).

10. For purposes of the FLSA, Defendant was an “employer” of Plaintiff, and Plaintiff was “employed” by Defendant, as those terms or variations thereof are used in Wis. Stat. §§ 109.01 *et seq.*, 103.01 *et seq.*, 104.01 *et seq.*, and Wis. Admin. Code § DWD 272.01.

11. Plaintiff, Daniel Watkins, is an adult male resident of the State of Wisconsin residing at 4037 West Calumet Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53209.

12. Plaintiff’s Notices of Consent to Join this collective action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b) is contemporaneously filed with this Complaint (ECF No. 1).

13. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff worked as an hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employee at Defendant’s Milwaukee, Wisconsin production facility, located at 5225 West Clinton Avenue, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53223.

14. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff worked alongside all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees as part of Defendant’s plastics packaging production process.

15. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all other similarly-situated current and former hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees who work at, worked at, and/or were employed by Defendant within the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1). Plaintiff performed similar job duties as other current and

former hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees who work at, worked at, and/or were employed by Defendant, and Plaintiff and all other current and former hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees were subject to Defendant's same unlawful compensation policies and practices as enumerated herein.

16. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff and all other current and former hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees on whose behalf they bring this Complaint performed compensable work in the same or similarly-titled positions at Defendant's direction, on Defendant's behalf, for Defendant's benefit, and/or with Defendant's knowledge at Defendant's Milwaukee, Wisconsin production facility.

17. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant supervised Plaintiff's day-to-day activities and the day-to-day activities of all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees.

18. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant hired, terminated, promoted, demoted, and suspended Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees.

19. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant reviewed Plaintiff's work performance and the work performance of all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees.

20. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant established the work rules, policies, and procedures by which Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees abided in the workplace.

21. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant controlled the terms and conditions of Plaintiff's employment and the employment of all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees.

22. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant established Plaintiff's work schedule and the work schedules of all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees.

23. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant established Plaintiff's and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees' hourly rates of pay and means of compensation.

24. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant provided Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees with work assignments and hours of work.

25. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff's hours of work and the hours of work of all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees were tracked and recorded by Defendant.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

26. In approximately October 2017, Plaintiff commenced employment at Defendant via a temporary staffing agency as a Production employee at Defendant's Milwaukee, Wisconsin production facility.

27. On or about July 9, 2019, Defendant hired Plaintiff directly as a Production employee.

28. During Plaintiff's employment with Defendant, Plaintiff reported directly to Robert Laughlin, Lead, who reported to Daniel Bruschback, Production Manager (until approximately December 2019), who reported directly to Michael Heyer, President.

29. During the entirety of Plaintiff's employment with Defendant, Defendant compensated Plaintiff on an hourly basis and/or with an hourly rate of pay.

30. During the entirety of Plaintiff's employment with Defendant, Plaintiff was a non-exempt employee for purposes of the FLSA and WWPCL.

31. On a daily basis during Plaintiff's employment with Defendant, Plaintiff worked alongside other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees as part of Defendant's plastic production process at Defendant's Milwaukee, Wisconsin production facility.

32. On a daily basis during Plaintiff's employment with Defendant, Plaintiff performed compensable work at Defendant's direction, on Defendant's behalf, for Defendant's benefit, and/or with Defendant's knowledge as an hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employee at Defendant's Milwaukee, Wisconsin production facility.

33. On or about January 12, 2020, Plaintiff's employment with Defendant ended.

34. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), all of Defendant's Production employees were hourly-paid, non-exempt employees.

35. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees regularly worked in excess of forty (40) hours per workweek.

36. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant compensated Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees on a bi-weekly basis via check.

37. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant's workweek for FLSA and WWPCL purposes was Sunday through Saturday.

38. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees were non-union employees of Defendant.

39. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees were subject to Defendant's same pay and timekeeping policies and practices.

40. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant maintained a manual punch-clock system (hereinafter simply "Defendant's manual timekeeping system") that Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees used on a daily basis for timekeeping and/or recordkeeping purposes.

41. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees used Defendant's manual timekeeping system on a daily basis for timekeeping and/or recordkeeping purposes.

42. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees

used Defendant's manual timekeeping system to "clock in" and to "clock out" of work each day at the beginning and end of their shifts, respectively.

43. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees used Defendant's manual timekeeping system to "clock out" and to "clock back in" for rest breaks and meal periods each work day.

44. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees performed compensable work immediately after "clocking in" via Defendant's manual timekeeping system at the beginning of their shifts and when returning from their rest breaks and/or meal periods each work day.

45. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees performed compensable work immediately prior to "clocking out" via Defendant's manual timekeeping system at the end of their shifts and when taking rest breaks and/or meal periods each work day.

46. Each work day during the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant required Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees to record their hours worked and work performed by "clocking in" at the beginning of their shifts (when compensable work commenced), "clocking out" and then "clocking back in" for rest breaks or meal periods during their shifts, and "clocking out" at the end of their shifts (when compensable work ceased) via Defendant's manual timekeeping system.

47. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees generally and customarily worked the following shifts each work week: “First Shift,” which was 5:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.; and/or “Second Shift,” which was 3:15 p.m. to 1:45 a.m.

48. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees used Defendant’s manual timekeeping system to record all hours worked and work performed each work day and each workweek.

49. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff’s and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees’ “clock in” and “clock out” times each work day via Defendant’s manual timekeeping system were kept, stored, and/or retained by Defendant.

50. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Plaintiff’s and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees’ “clock in” and “clock out” times each work day via Defendant’s manual timekeeping system – including for all rest breaks and meal periods each work day – recorded, reflected, and represented the actual hours worked and work performed each work day and each workweek by Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees.

51. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant’s pay policies and practices failed to compensate Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees for all hours actually worked and/or work performed each work day and each workweek as recorded, reflected, and represented via Defendant’s manual timekeeping system.

52. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant's compensation practice applicable to Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees was to round or adjust said employees' actual hours worked and/or work performed each work day as recorded, reflected, and represented via Defendant's manual timekeeping system in the following manner: forward in intervals of fifteen (15) minutes at the beginning of said employees' shifts; forward in intervals of fifteen (15) minutes during employees' shifts; and backwards in intervals of fifteen (15) minutes at the end of said employees' shifts. Such a practice resulted in Defendant shaving time from Plaintiff's and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees' timesheets each work day and each workweek for pre-shift, post-shift, and in-shift hours worked and/or work performed while "clocked in" via Defendant's manual timekeeping system.

53. For example, when Plaintiff and other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees arrived to work at Defendant on any given work day and "clocked in" via Defendant's manual timekeeping system at 4:50 a.m. and immediately began performing compensable work prior to the "First Shift" scheduled start time of 5:00 a.m., Defendant's practice was to begin compensating Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees as of 5:00 a.m. on that work day.

54. For example, when Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees arrived to work at Defendant on any given work day and "clocked in" (late) at 5:01 a.m. via Defendant's manual timekeeping system for their "First Shift" scheduled start time of 5:00 a.m. and immediately began performing compensable work, Defendant's practice was to begin compensating Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees as of 5:15 a.m. on that work day.

55. For example, when Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees took rest breaks and/or meal periods during their respective shifts on any given work day, Defendant's compensation practice was to "dock" Plaintiff and other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees fifteen (15) minutes' worth of pay if said employees did not promptly return from said rest breaks and/or meal periods.

56. For example, when Plaintiff and other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees "clocked out" (early) at 3:29 p.m. via Defendant's manual timekeeping system on any given work day after immediately ceasing performing compensable work prior to their "First Shift" scheduled end time of 3:30 p.m., Defendant's practice was to round or adjust Plaintiff's and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees' "clock out" times to 3:15 p.m. for compensation purposes on that work day.

57. For example, when Plaintiff and other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees "clocked out" via Defendant's manual timekeeping system on any given work day at 3:44 p.m. after immediately ceasing performing compensable work for the day (and after their "First Shift" scheduled end time of 3:30 p.m.), Defendant's practice was to round or adjust Plaintiff's and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees' "clock out" times to 3:30 p.m. for compensation purposes on that work day.

58. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant shaved time from Plaintiff's and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees' timesheets for in-shift compensable work performed by failing to compensate said employees for rest breaks and meal periods that were not work free and/or that lasted less than thirty (30) consecutive minutes in duration as recorded and reflected via Defendant's manual timekeeping system.

59. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant's weekly routine or practice was to collect Plaintiff's and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees' physical timecards (on which their names and actual "clock in" and "clock out" times via Defendant's manual timekeeping system were recorded) on the Monday following the end of the prior workweek. Then, Defendant manually shaved time from Plaintiff's and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees' physical timecards as described herein, and entered the shaved time into Defendant's computer system, which was sent to Defendant's payroll company to compensate Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employee on a bi-weekly basis.

60. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant shaved time from Plaintiff's and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees' timesheets each work day and each workweek for pre-shift, post-shift, and in-shift compensable work performed by failing to compensate Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees when compensable work commenced each work day (as recorded, reflected, and represented via Defendant's manual timekeeping system); instead, Defendant compensating Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees based on the shaved time each workweek.

61. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant's pay policies and practices failed to compensate Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees for work performed each work day as described herein despite Defendant having an actual and accurate record of said employees' pre-shift, post-shift, and in-shift hours worked and/or work performed via its manual timekeeping system.

62. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant knew and/or was aware that its pay policies and practices failed to compensate Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees for pre-shift, post-shift, and in-shift compensable work performed as described herein despite having a record of all hours worked and work performed each work day and each workweek via its manual timekeeping system.

63. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant did not properly and lawfully compensate Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees for all hours actually worked and/or work performed each work day and each workweek, including but not limited to at an overtime rate of pay.

64. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1), Defendant's policies in practice unlawfully and impermissibly failed to, on a daily and/or weekly basis, compensate Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees when compensable work commenced and ceased each work day.

65. During the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1) and during workweeks when no overtime was due, if any, Defendant suffered or permitted Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees to work without being paid appropriate and lawful compensation for all hours worked and/or work performed each work day and each workweek.

66. Defendant was or should have been aware that its compensation policies in practice failed to compensate Plaintiff and all other hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees in the same or similar fashion for all hours worked and/or work performed each work day and each workweek, including but not limited to at an overtime rate of pay.

COLLECTIVE ACTION ALLEGATIONS UNDER THE FLSA

67. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all other similarly situated employees as authorized under the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). The similarly situated employees include:

All hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees employed by Defendant within the three (3) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1) who have not been compensated for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours in a workweek as a result of Defendant's timeshaving practices.

68. Defendant, as a matter of policy and practice, did not compensate its employees for all compensable hours worked or work performed each work day (and on a workweek basis) by the FLSA Collective. Specifically, Defendant's unlawful compensation practice shaved time from the FLSA Collective's timesheets for all pre-shift, post-shift, and in-shift hours worked and/or work performed each work day while "clocked in" via Defendant's manual timekeeping system. These practices resulted in Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective being denied overtime compensation by Defendant at the rate of one and one-half times their regular hourly rate of pay for hours worked in excess of forty (40) in a workweek.

69. The First Claim for Relief is brought under and maintained as opt-in Collective Actions pursuant to § 216(b) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. 216(b), by Plaintiff on behalf of the FLSA Collectives.

70. The FLSA Collective claims may be pursued by those who affirmatively opt in to this case, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

71. Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective are and have been similarly situated, have and have had substantially similar job requirements and pay provisions, and are and have been subject to Defendant's decisions, policies, plans and programs, practices, procedures, protocols, routines, and rules willfully failing and refusing to compensate them for each hour worked including overtime compensation. The claims of Plaintiff as stated herein are the same as those of the FLSA Collective.

72. Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective seek relief on a collective basis challenging, among other FLSA violations, Defendant's practice of failing to properly and lawfully compensate employees for all work performed and/or hours worked, including overtime compensation, each workweek.

73. The FLSA Collective is readily ascertainable. For purpose of notice and other purposes related to this action, the names, phone numbers, and addresses are readily available from Defendant. Notice can be provided to the FLSA Collective via first class mail to the last address known by Defendant and through posting at Defendant's facility in areas where postings are normally made.

74. Defendant's conduct, as set forth in this Complaint, was willful and in bad faith, and has caused significant damages to Plaintiff and the putative FLSA Collective.

RULE 23 CLASS ALLEGATIONS - WISCONSIN

75. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all other similarly-situated employees pursuant to the WWPCCL, under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23. The similarly situated employees include:

All hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees employed by Defendant within the two (2) year period immediately preceding the filing of this Complaint (ECF No. 1) who have not been compensated for all hours worked in a workweek as a result of Defendant's timeshaving practices.

76. The members of the Wisconsin Class are readily ascertainable. The number and identity of the members of the Wisconsin Class are determinable from the records of Defendant. The job titles, length of employment, and the rates of pay for each member of the Wisconsin Class are also determinable from Defendant's records. For purposes of notice and other purposes related to this action, their names and addresses are readily available from Defendant. Notice can be provided by means permissible under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23.

77. The proposed Wisconsin Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable, and more importantly the disposition of their claims as a class will benefit the parties and the Court. Although the precise number of such persons is unknown, upon information and belief, there are over fifty (50) members of the Wisconsin Class.

78. Plaintiff's claims are typical of those claims which could be alleged by any members of the Wisconsin Class, and the relief sought is typical of the relief which would be sought by each member of the Wisconsin Class in separate actions. All of the members of the Wisconsin Class were subject to the same corporate practices of Defendant, as alleged herein. Defendant's corporate-wide policies and practices affected all members of the Wisconsin Class similarly, and Defendant benefited from the same type of unfair and/or wrongful acts as to each

member of the Wisconsin Class. Plaintiff and other members of the Wisconsin Class sustained similar losses, injuries and damages arising from the same unlawful policies and practices and procedures.

79. Plaintiff is able to fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Wisconsin Class and has no interests antagonistic to the Wisconsin Class. Plaintiff is represented by counsel who are experienced and competent in both collective/class action litigation and employment litigation and have previously represented plaintiffs in wage and hour cases.

80. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy – particularly in the context of wage and hour litigation where individual class members lack the financial resources to vigorously prosecute a lawsuit against corporate defendants. Class action treatment will permit a number of similarly-situated persons to prosecute their common claims in a single forum simultaneously, efficiently, and without the unnecessary duplication of efforts and expense that numerous individual actions engender. Because the losses, injuries and damages suffered by each of the individual Wisconsin Class members are small in the sense pertinent to a class action analysis, the expenses and burden of individual litigation would make it extremely difficult or impossible for the individual members of the Wisconsin Class to redress the wrongs done to them.

81. Important public interests will be served by addressing the matter as a class action. The adjudication of individual litigation claims would result in a great expenditure of Court and public resources; however, treating the claims as a class action would result in a significant saving of these costs. The prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the Wisconsin Class would create a risk of inconsistent and/or varying adjudications with respect to the individual members of the Wisconsin Class, establishing incompatible standards of

conduct for Defendant and resulting in the impairment of class members' rights and the disposition of their interests through actions to which they were not parties. The issues in this action can be decided by means of common, class-wide proof. In addition, if appropriate, the Court can, and is empowered to, fashion methods to efficiently manage this action as a class action.

82. Defendant has violated the WWPCCL regarding payment of regular wages and overtime wages. Current employees are often afraid to assert their rights out of fear of direct or indirect retaliation. Former employees are fearful of bringing claims because doing so can harm their employment, future employment, and future efforts to secure employment. Class actions provide class members who are not named in the Complaint a degree of anonymity which allows for the vindication of their rights while eliminating or reducing these risks.

83. There are questions of fact and law common to the Wisconsin Class that predominate over any questions affecting only individual members. The questions of law and fact common to the Wisconsin Class arising from Defendant's actions include, without limitation, the following: (1) Whether the work performed by Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Classes is compensable under federal law and/or Wisconsin law; (2) Whether Defendant engaged in a pattern or practice of forcing, coercing, deceiving and/or permitting Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class to perform work for Defendant's benefit without being properly compensated; (3) Whether Defendant failed to pay Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class for all work Defendant suffered or permitted them to perform each work day and each workweek; and (4) The nature and extent of class-wide injury and the measure of damages for the injury.

84. The questions set forth above predominate over any questions affecting only individual persons, and a class action is superior with respect to considerations of consistency,

economy, efficiency, fairness and equity, to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the state law claims.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF
Violations of the FLSA – Unpaid Overtime
(Plaintiff on behalf of himself and the FLSA Collective)

85. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the FLSA Collective, reassert and incorporate by reference all paragraphs set forth above as if restated herein.

86. At all times material herein, Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective have been entitled to the rights, protections, and benefits provided under the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 201 *et seq.*

87. At all times material herein, Defendant was an employer of Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective as provided under the FLSA.

88. At all times material herein, Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective were employees of Defendant as provided under the FLSA.

89. Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective are victims of uniform compensation policy and practice in violation of the FLSA.

90. Defendant violated the FLSA by suffering or permitting Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective to perform work without being properly or lawfully compensated for each hour worked in excess of forty (40) hours each workweek. Specifically, Defendant's unlawful compensation practice shaved time from the FLSA Collective's timesheets for all pre-shift, post-shift, and in-shift hours worked and/or work performed while "clocked in" via Defendant's manual timekeeping system. By failing to compensate the FLSA Collective in such a fashion as described herein, this unlawful compensation practice denied Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective overtime premium pay for each hour they worked in excess of forty (40) hours each workweek and for which Defendant is liable pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 216(b).

91. The FLSA regulates, among other things, the payment of an overtime premium by employers whose employees are engaged in commerce, or engaged in the production of goods for commerce, or employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. 29 U.S.C. § 207(a)(1).

92. Defendant was and is subject to the overtime pay requirements of the FLSA because Defendant is an enterprise engaged in commerce and/or its employees are engaged in commerce, as defined in FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 203(b).

93. Defendant's failure to properly compensate Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective and failure to properly record all compensable work time was willfully perpetrated. Defendant has not acted in good faith nor with reasonable grounds to believe that its actions and omissions were not a violation of the FLSA, and as a result thereof, Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective are entitled to recover an award of liquidated damages in an amount equal to the amount of unpaid overtime premium pay described above pursuant to Section 216(b) of the FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b). Alternatively, should the Court find that Defendant did not act willfully in failing to pay overtime premium pay wages, Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective are entitled to an award of pre-judgment interest at the applicable legal rate.

94. Plaintiff and the FLSA Collective are entitled to damages equal to the mandated overtime premium pay within the three (3) years preceding the date of filing of this Complaint, plus periods of equitable tolling because Defendant acted willfully and knew or showed reckless disregard of whether its conduct was prohibited by the FLSA.

95. Pursuant to FLSA, 29 U.S.C. § 216(b), successful plaintiffs are entitled to reimbursement of the costs and attorneys' fees expended in successfully prosecuting an action for unpaid wages and overtime wages.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF
Violation of the WWPCL – Unpaid Overtime and Regular Wages
(Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Wisconsin Class)

96. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Wisconsin Class, re-allege and incorporate all previous paragraphs as if they were set forth herein.

97. At all relevant times, Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class were employees of Defendant within the meaning of Wis. Stat. §§ 109.01(1r), 103.001(5), and 104.01(2)(a).

98. At all relevant times, Defendant was an employer of Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class within the meaning of Wis. Stat. §§ 109.01(2), 103.001(6), and 104.01(3)(a), and Wis. Admin. Code § DWD 272.01(5).

99. At all relevant times, Defendant has employed, and continues to employ, Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class within the meaning of Wis. Stat. §§ 109.01 *et seq.*, 103.01 *et seq.*, 104.01 *et seq.*, and Wis. Admin. Code § DWD 272.01.

100. Throughout the Wisconsin Class Period, Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class regularly performed activities that were an integral and indispensable part of their principal activities without receiving compensation for these activities.

101. At all relevant times, Defendant had common policies, programs, practices, procedures, protocols, routines, and rules of willfully failing to properly pay Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class regular wages and overtime compensation.

102. Throughout the Wisconsin Class Period, Defendant maintained and perpetrated an unlawful compensation practice that shaved time from Plaintiff's and the Wisconsin Class' timesheets for all pre-shift, post-shift, and in-shift hours worked and/or work performed while "clocked in" via Defendant's manual timekeeping system each work day and each workweek, resulting in Defendant impermissibly and unlawfully failing to compensate Plaintiff and the

Wisconsin Class for any and all hours worked and/or work performed each work day and each workweek at a regular and/or at an overtime rate of pay, in violation of the WWPCL.

103. Defendant willfully failed to pay Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class regular wages and overtime premium compensation for all hours worked in excess of forty (40) hours a workweek, in violation of the WWPCL.

104. As set forth above, Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class members have sustained losses in their compensation as a proximate result of Defendant's violations. Accordingly, Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class seek damages in the amount of their respective unpaid compensation, injunctive relief requiring Defendant to cease and desist from its violations of the Wisconsin laws described herein and to comply with them, and such other legal and equitable relief as the Court deems just and proper. Under Wis. Stat. § 109.11, Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class may be entitled to liquidated damages equal and up to fifty percent (50%) of the unpaid wages.

105. Plaintiff and the Wisconsin Class seek recovery of attorneys' fees and the costs of this action to be paid by Defendant pursuant to the WWPCL.

WHEREFORE, it is respectfully prayed that this Court grant the following relief:

- a) At the earliest possible time, issue an Order allowing Notice, or issue such Court supervised Notice, to all similarly-situated current and former hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees who worked at and/or were employed by Defendant informing them of this action and their rights to participate in this action. Such Notice shall inform all similarly-situated current and qualified former employees of the pendency of this action, the nature of this action, and of their right to "opt in" to this action. Additionally, such notice will include a statement informing the similarly-situated current and qualified former employees that it is illegal for Defendant to take any actions in retaliation of their consent to join this action;
- b) At the earliest possible time, issue an Order certifying this action as a class action pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23;

- c) At the earliest possible time, issue an Order appointing Walcheske & Luzi, LLC as class counsel pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23;
- d) Issue an Order, pursuant to the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202, declaring Defendant's actions as described in the Complaint as unlawful and in violation of the FLSA and Wisconsin Law and applicable regulations and as willful as defined in the FLSA and Wisconsin Law;
- e) Issue an Order directing and requiring Defendant to pay Plaintiff and all other similarly-situated hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees damages in the form of reimbursement for unpaid regular wages and unpaid overtime wages for all time spent performing compensable work for which they were not paid pursuant to the rate provided by the FLSA and WWPC;L;
- f) Issue an Order directing and requiring Defendant to pay Plaintiff and all other similarly-situated hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees liquidated damages pursuant to the FLSA and WWPC;L in an amount equal to, and in addition to the amount of wages and overtime wages owed to them;
- g) Issue an Order directing Defendant to reimburse Plaintiff and all other similarly-situated hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees for the costs and attorneys' fees expended in the course of litigating this action, pre-judgment and post-judgment interest; and
- h) Provide Plaintiff and all other similarly-situated hourly-paid, non-exempt Production employees with other relief that the Court deems just and equitable.

PLAINTIFF DEMAND A JURY AS TO ALL TRIABLE ISSUES

Dated this 26th day of February, 2020

WALCHESKE & LUZI, LLC
Counsel for Plaintiff

s/ **Scott S. Luzi**

James A. Walcheske, State Bar No. 1065635
Scott S. Luzi, State Bar No. 1067405
David M. Potteiger, State Bar No. 1067009

WALCHESKE & LUZI, LLC
15850 W. Bluemound Road, Suite 304
Brookfield, Wisconsin 53005
Phone: (262) 780-1953
Fax: (262) 565-6469
jwalcheske@walcheskeluzi.com
sluzi@walcheskeluzi.com
dpotteiger@walcheskeluzi.com